



Linguistics and Literature Review (LLR)

Volume 5, Issue 1, March 2019

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr>

Issue DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.51>

ISSN: 2221-6510 (Print) 2409-109X (Online) Journal homepage: <http://journals.umt.edu.pk/llr/Home.aspx>

A Discourse Analysis of Speeches Delivered by the Prominent Indian Politicians on Important Official Forums

Yasir Abbas Baig

To cite to this article: Yasir Abbas Baig (2019). A Discourse Analysis of Speeches Delivered by the Prominent Indian Politicians on Important Official Forums, *Linguistics and Literature Review* 5 (1): 49- 61.

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.51.04>

Published online: March 31, 2019

Article QR Code:



Yasir Abbas Baig



A publication of the
Department of English Language and Literature
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
University of Management and Technology
Lahore, Pakistan

A Discourse Analysis of Speeches Delivered By the Prominent Indian Politicians on Important Official Forums

Yasir Abbas Baig

Government Murray College-Sialkot, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The present research paper studies the discourse of the selected speeches from the prominent Indian statesmen. It includes Mr. Manmohan Singh's address to Indian Elected Assembly (Lok Sabha) as Prime Minister of India, S.M. Krishna's (Foreign Minister of India) speech to the UN, General Assembly, Prime Minister Narendra Modi's address to the UN General Assembly and the speech of Mrs. Sushma Swaraj (the present foreign minister) to the 73rd session of the UN General Assembly. This work is a discourse of the speeches delivered by these politicians representing Indian government on different occasions. There emerge a few common patterns in the speeches of these politicians who in fact, represent different political parties in India. These four speeches fall within the years 2009 to 2018 but they represent a few consistent structures. Ruth Wodak's model is used to explain how Indian politicians create an image of positive self and negative others. There has been a dominant discourse of eying Pakistan with suspicion and a terror sponsoring country. On the other hand, India is projected in the light of a developing, responsible, democratic and progressive country that believes in human rights and social welfare. The discourse finds a conscious effort on the part of the four speakers to appreciate India as a positively contributing welfare state in the committee of nations. However, the presence of a terror sponsoring neighbor: Pakistan; is a constant challenge for their stability and the peace. These speeches try to build a discourse which projects Pakistan a threat for the world in general and for India in particular.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, advertisement, persuasive strategies, electronic media, advertising discourse

Introduction

Pakistan and India are the two nuclear powers and important countries of South East Asia; they share a common history before the partition on August 14, 1947. Unfortunately, however, even after more than seventy years of independence both the countries share an unenviable history of neighborhood. The relationship between the two countries has always been problematic with both sides accusing each other of betrayal and deceit. They have fought three conventional wars in

1947, 1965 and 1971 and almost a two-month military-conflict at Kargil in 1999. There has been a trust deficit between the two neighbors since the independence of the two nations from the British Rule. Mahmood (2002, p.185) observes that the prospects of establishing normal relationship between India and Pakistan are very slim. Burki (1991: 189) considers that many of the top Indian leaders believed that India-Pakistan partition would be temporary and Pakistan would go back to be a part of India.

In the year 1974, India declared it a nuclear power and conducted further tests in 1998, and Pakistan responded almost immediately (Synnott, 2009). The two countries have had brief episodes of a pledge of conditional friendship, there have been few efforts for the normalization of the relations but the overall picture when it comes to good diplomatic relations is grim and undesirable. The diplomats, politicians and the government representatives from both sides accuse each other for such poor relationship. The people from both the countries are the ones to suffer heavily and bear the brunt of the bad and problematic relations. The migrants (mostly Muslims) who chose to live in Pakistan after the division of 1947 had their friends, relatives and businesses in India. They have their past connections in India and many Indians having some affiliation on the Pakistani side of the border. This lack of trust between the governments of the two countries means difficulties in the lives of the people on both sides, especially those who have connections on both sides of the divide. There are strict visa regulations and trust deficit which makes it very hard for the people from both the countries to travel one another's countries.

The heavy deployment of the armies from both the countries and almost a constant exchange of fire on the borders is a constant horror for the people living near the border villages. The misery of the situation worsens when one considers that both India and Pakistan are the nuclear states and the whole region along with the whole world is under a constant threat of an atomic annihilation. An atomic war, although unlikely but cannot be ruled out, considering the bitter history of wars between the two countries. A more responsible and tolerant approach is expected from both the countries. India being the seventh largest country of the world by area, having a population of 1.3 billion making it the second most populous country and it is at present the biggest democracy of the world. Pakistan although a smaller country in comparison to India yet it has an importance in its own right. Pakistan is also a Muslim nuclear power. It is the sixth most populous country in the world and by area it is the thirty third largest country. The bitter relationships of the two countries seem to be rooted in the very event of the partition, with Hindu majority unhappy at the creation of a new country and breaking of the geographical might of undivided India. India opposes the concept of two nation theory which is the chief reason behind the creation of Pakistan as an independent state. The very partition was also beset by controversy when it came to the affiliation of different states. The accession of the Kashmir valley to India created an infuriation and dissatisfaction in the Kashmir valley as well as Pakistan. Having the majority of Muslim population, it is assumed that most of the Kashmiri people wanted an alliance with Pakistan. This unpleasant event is one of those which form the background of the tense political relations; on the other hand, Indian politicians seem to follow a method in blaming Pakistan for the poor relationship as they project India as a peaceful and responsible power, which has been struggling

to cope with what they accuse an irresponsible state like Pakistan. The stance of the top Indian officials towards the state of Pakistan is usually harsh and relentless. Most of the terrorism incidents taking place in India are linked with the Pakistani state and establishment. In present scenario the diplomatic and political relations between the two neighbors lack trust and confidence.

The poor relations between the two countries are a constant threat to the peace and prosperity of the region. This research work intends to perform a discourse analysis of prominent Indian politicians to find out their discursive practice to create a positive image for themselves and negative face of Pakistan.

Purpose

The purpose of the present research is to find out whether this stance of Indian establishment and political elite is a casual one or there is some well thought about and planned method to this targeted approach. There have been different political parties ruling India since their independence but this study focuses on the speeches by the top Indian political/governmental representatives of the previous two decades to figure out how language is employed by them for self-glorification and blaming Pakistan for being an irresponsible state.

Implications

The present study has implications if it can point out a method behind the Indian discourse for the world as projected through speeches of their political leadership irrespective of their local political affiliations. The discourse analysis can have implications as there are motives behind the linguistic manipulation (using language to build attractive self-image and distorting the image of others) to create a positive self-image. It can lead us to understand a definitive policy adopted by India in dealing with Pakistan. This may point out that this state policy can be monitored and encountered with an appropriate discourse.

Objectives

The objective of this research study is to find how Indian politicians from the present and past government consistently build image of India as a growing economic and political power in contrast to Pakistan as an irresponsible country of the region. This study selects four speeches delivered by Manmohan Singh as Indian Prime Minister, S.M. Krishna as Indian Foreign Minister, Narendra Modi as Indian Prime Minister and Sushma Swaraj, on important national and international forums. The researcher intends to have the discourse analysis of these speeches. The objective is to investigate the language used by these politicians and find out how through the use of language they create a discourse of self-glorification and progress. How India is projected as a responsible country and at the same time there is an objective to find how discourse is created to malign the image of neighboring Pakistan.

Research Questions

- What are the major patterns that emerge from the speeches of the selected Indian politicians?
- How is Pakistan treated in the speeches made by Indian politicians on important forums?
- Does Indian policy of presenting Pakistan's image change with the change over the years?
- Is there a consistent picture of Pakistan emerging through the speeches of these Indian politicians irrespective of their national political affiliation?

Theoretical Underpinning

The research questions and objectives will be dealt from the point of view of linguistics discourse in the political and policy matters by the politicians. The frame work adopted for this analysis is that Ruth Wodak's theory of creating a positive-self and negative-other presentation. Language is manipulated to achieve the desired impact in the politics all over the world. "It is strategic for politicians to use political rhetoric to persuade people to act in the way they (politicians) want." (Alvi & Jalilifar, 2011, p. 44). Bhatia (2006: 174-180) writes that "political discourse enables politicians to achieve their desired communicative purposes". They do this by using words and phrases that reflect an attractive image for themselves and the opponent or targeted other is mentioned with words that construct their negative image. Hence, a strong link can be established between the way language is used and the political objectives that can be achieved through it. Presenting one's own image positively, negative image building of opponents, use of rhetoric, the choice of high-sounding words for one's own political cult and dehumanizing the face of the targeted country are some of the techniques used by the politicians in their political speeches. According to (Jones & Peccei, 2004) the chief value of a linguistic expression cannot be underestimated as language can be employed to effect people with a desired philosophy.

Fairclough (2000) contends that power is enacted and practiced through the discourse. "It is difficult to imagine politics without persuasion, by its very nature politics requires choices to be formulated, options to be weighed and decisions to be made" (Martin, 2014: 11). Similarly, (Bhatia, 2006: 173) asserts "The multidimensionality of political discourse has attracted a great deal of attention from discourse analysts". Hence, the politicians try to create a discourse that benefits their agenda and this research work tries to have a discourse of the speeches with this theoretical concept in view. The speeches are viewed with a discourse analytical approach to find out the implied ideas in them. Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010: 56) assert that the discourse analysis ponders over the forms of language and context, this helps in the understanding of social and cultural forces that effect our lives. The theoretical dimensions explained by Ruth Wodak help this study to analyse the linguistic data and find out the structures intended by the speakers.

Data Collection

The sample collected for the present research is purposive. The data is the text of the four speeches by major Indian politicians and government representatives. These speeches were delivered at

important forums and on important national and international occasions. These speeches are open for opinions, comments and criticism by the reviewers, writers and researcher from all parts of the world. S.M. Krishna, Sushma Swaraj, Manmohan Singh and Narendra Modi are the four speakers whose speeches are analysed. All these speakers have the rank of top political figures of their country.

Nature of the Data

Data is present in the form of video recording and authentic text of the speeches delivered by these figures. The original transcripts of the text and the English translations in the case of the speech in Hindi language are also available on the official websites of these political parties and Indian government's official sites. These speeches are also publically available on you tube, different websites and are also present on the archives of the UN, national and international newspapers and their online editions.

Demographics of the Speakers

Brief information of the selected speakers is given below in the table 1 and table 2. The tables describe their status as speakers and their affiliation with the political parties.

Table 1. A description of the Indian politicians with their year of speech at UN

Sr. No:	Name of the Speaker	Designation	Occasion	Date/Year of speech
1.	S.M. Krishna	Foreign Minister	UN General Assembly	29 September, 2010
2.	Manmohan Singh	Prime Minister	Lok Sabah (Elected Assembly)	29 July, 2009
3.	Narendra Modi	Prime Minister	(UN, General Assembly)	27 September, 2014
4.	Sushmata Swaraj	Foreign Minister	(UN, General Assembly)	29 September, 2018

Table 2 A description of the political affiliation of the Indian politicians

Sr. No	Name of the Speaker	Designation	Political Affiliation	Term in Office
1.	S.M Krishna	Foreign Minister	Indian National Congress	22 May 2009 to 26 October, 2012

2.	Manmohan Singh	Prime Minister	Indian National Congress	22 May, 2004 to 26 May, 2014
3.	Narendra Modi	Prime Minister	Bharitaya Janata Party	26 May 2014 to Present
4.	Sushma Swaraj	Foreign Minister	Bharitya Janata Party	26 May 2014 to Present

Ethical Considerations

It is important to seek permission from the participants of the research. But it is not always imperative to get a personal permission from the participants of a study. All the speeches, included in this research are already present on various international, national forums, newspapers and websites. These speeches are an open public document for the people to read, view and have their analysis. These speeches have been collected from official online newspaper sites and you tube. So, there is no prior need for seeking the permission, in order to investigate these speeches. However, there is an honest effort to analyse these speeches authentically from a linguistic view point without enforcing a personal agenda or desired interpretation of these speeches. The transcript of the speeches is present in the appendix of this study.

Data Analysis

The first speech analysed here is from Mr. S.M Krishna who remained the foreign minister of India from 22 May 2009 to 26 October 2012. It was Indian National Congress that had formed government in India during those years. He was the minister of external affairs during the rule of Indian National Congress. He addressed the 65th session of UN General Assembly on Wednesday, 29 September 2010. He talks of the Indian commitment to stand by the principles of the UN. First, I will give linguistic expressions in his speech that build a positive self-image. He claims that India is ‘fully committed’ to the ‘principles’ of the UN. He calls it a ‘satisfaction’ as India played a ‘pro-active role’ in women empowerment. He talks of ‘strong commitment’ for the strengthening of UN WOMEN. There is an expression of Indian role in peacekeeping when he asserts, “India has contributed over 100,000 peacekeepers in nearly every major UN peacekeeping operation. It stands committed to UN peacekeeping.” There is the mentioning of India who has ‘consistently contributed to the developmental and humanitarian activities of UN.” He assures that his government gives ‘highest priority’ to the Millennium Development Goals. For the socio-economic intervention India is pursuing ‘ambitious programmes’, ‘free people from poverty’, ‘provide universal education’ and ‘ensure health care’ for the Indians. Talking of challenges, he claims that they are doing

‘everything possible’, to ‘contribute’ to the global action on climate change. Regarding his meeting on Disarmament he assures to ‘lend India’s support for the objectives of that meeting; there is once again the assertion, ‘we remain committed’. Moving on the second aspect of ‘negative-other presentation’ in his speech, he talks mostly about Pakistan. There are expressions like: ‘militancy’ and ‘terrorism in Pakistan’, ‘Pakistan sponsored militancy and terrorism’, ‘Pakistan cannot impart lessons to us on democracy’. He calls for Pakistan to take positive steps to ‘reduce the trust deficit’ between the two countries.

The second speech analysed in this paper is from Mr. Manmohan Singh who was the Indian Prime Minister (representing All India Congress) from 2004 to 2014. He delivered this speech to explain his stance in the Lok Sabha after meeting his Pakistani counterpart, Mr. Yousuf Raza Gillani. He met Mr. Gillani on 16th of July, 2009, at NAM summit in Sharm-el-Sheikh: the Egyptian city. He expressed his government’s inability to engage in peace process with Pakistan if its soil is used to for terrorist attack against Indian citizens. There are expressions in his speech that intend to create a positive self-image. In the wake of terrorist attacks what he believes from Pakistani soil, he claims: “We exercised great restraint”. He wishes to ‘have as many friends’, and also talks of ‘self-help’. Mr. Manmohan reiterates his government’s strategy as having ‘a policy of zero-tolerance towards terrorism’. He promises to ‘spare no effort and no expense to defend’ the ‘sovereignty, unity and integrity’ of the country. There is the mentioning of ‘our resolve’ to ‘defeat terrorism’, ‘no interest in destabilizing Pakistan’. He also talks of the ‘large aid programme that is benefiting’ the Afghani people. There is also a claim by the ex-Indian Prime Minister: “We know that we are doing nothing wrong.” In this speech too, language is used to build the negative-other image of Pakistan. There are phrases like: ‘terrorist attacks launched from Pakistani soil’, ‘terrorist organization based in Pakistan’, ‘ghastly terrorist act in India’. There is a demand from Pakistan to show seriousness in acting against terrorists when he says, “We need evidence that action is being taken,” there are other countries too that are victims of ‘Pakistan-based terrorism’. He reminds the Pakistani government to ensure that terrorist activities ‘were not perpetrated from their territory’ and Pakistanis ‘fulfill their commitment in letter and spirit’. He also demands: “Pakistan must defeat terrorism” if it does not want to be ‘consumed by it’.

The third speech included for analysis is from Narendra Modi who represented India in 69th session of United Nations General Assembly. The Indian Prime Minister tells the world of his country as representative of the one-sixth of the human race. In his speech also, there is a constant effort to portray the positive self-image using the language. While talking of India, he claims that he is aware of the ‘expectations of the world’ from ‘1.25 billion people’. He boasts of India representing ‘one-sixth of humanity’, the economic and social progress in India is termed as a phenomenon ‘rarely seen in history’. There is the talk of ‘India’s ancient wisdom’, which sees the world ‘as one family’, and assurance that his country has ‘an unwavering belief in multilateralism’. India is heading towards progress and wishes ‘a peaceful and stable environment for its development’. His country gives ‘highest priority’ on ‘advancing friendship’ and ‘cooperation’ with the neighbors. He claims to come from a ‘philosophical

tradition' and offers the world to 'work together' for prosperity and peace. For the people of India, 'respect for nature is an integral part of spiritualism', the blessings of nature are taken as sacred. In the speech of Narendra Modi too, there is the mentioning of Pakistan and once again India is projected as having a wish for friendly relations but 'peaceful atmosphere' is needed without the 'shadow of terrorism'. It is mentioned that it is Pakistan's responsibility to create 'an appropriate environment'.

The fourth speech selected for analysis is from Sushma Swaraj the present Indian foreign minister representing the ruling Bhartiya Janata Party. She spoke on the 73rd session of the United Nations General Assembly. The similar approach of the positive self-image and the effort to create negative other is found in her speech. She calls with 'equal pride' that the first woman to hold that honorable chair was an Indian in 1953 during the 8th session of United Nations. Her speech consists of some positive and praiseworthy vocabulary for India as she claims assuring the UN, 'India will not let you fail'. On behalf of the Indian government she reiterates that they are 'committed' to achieve the set 'objectives'. Under the leadership of Narendra Modi, there is 'unprecedented economic and social transformation' in the country. She calls these reforms 'the world's biggest exercise in poverty elimination and social transformation'. The economic schemes are termed as 'world's largest financial inclusion scheme'; the health program is called "the world's biggest health insurance program", the housing scheme is described as 'the largest housing scheme in the world'. There is a concept of 'New India' introduced with plans that will ensure: 'clean India, healthy India, prosperous India, secure India, educated India, developed India, energized India and strong India. She expressed the confidence by saying: "We will reach that horizon." India has 'risen' to face 'the challenge' of change in climate. There is a reference to the favourite bhajan (a religious song) of Mahatma Gandhi that throws light on the importance of humanity. He who feels the 'pain of another' is a 'good human being', he who 'helps without becoming arrogant is a good human being'. In this speech, there is also the portraying of negative other image. In her speech too, it is Pakistan presented with negative words used for forming its poor image. Pakistan is accused of being 'an expert in trying to mask malevolence with verbal duplicity'. Pakistan is criticized for providing 'sanctuary' to Osama Bin Laden. Pakistan is called a country with 'commitment to terrorism as an instrument of official policy'. It is mentioned that the American intelligence agencies found the truth of Pakistan's 'hypocrisy'. She tells the audience that FATF has placed 'Pakistan on notice over terror funding'. The failure in Pakistan-India talks is also referred to as the reason for 'Pakistan's behaviour'. Further she tells the world of 'Pak sponsored terrorists' who attacked Pathankot on January the 2nd. There are negative utterances like: 'Pakistan glorifies killers', 'it refuses to see the blood of innocents', 'a habit with Pakistan to throw the dust of deceit and deception against India', 'false accusations have become a part of its (Pakistan's) standard rhetoric. She calls Pakistan a country that issues postage stamps 'glorifying terrorists'. The linguistic data presented in the speech of Sushma Swaraj highlights a set approach of presenting one's own positive image and debasing the image of other in this case it is Pakistan whose image is presented in the negative light.

Results and Discussion

If analysed from a linguistic point of view, the framework provided by Ruth Wodak helps to interpret the results and draw conclusions. In politics, it is a discursive practice used by the politicians to build a discourse through language which helps them to project their favorable opinion in the eyes of the people. The language is also employed by the politicians to malign and distort the faces of others, especially whom they consider their opponents. The speeches analysed in this research study indicate that when it comes to talk of India as a country and the Indians as a nation the words used are positive and appreciable. But while talking of Pakistan the vocabulary indicates a choice of words that paint its unattractive picture. The politicians selected for this research study belong to the Indian political parties with different ideologies. These parties contest elections with respective national agenda. In the national politics, they have their differences on the policies and future policies. However, when it comes to the projection of India on the official national and international forums, the general picture of India has a harmony of description. The image presented is that of a rising country; moving towards progress and prosperity. When it comes to the discussion of neighboring countries, Pakistan is mentioned in harsh terms and a negative light.

There is specific strategy that can be established through language links in the speeches of the politicians included in this study. The data shows all the Indian politicians used words as ‘trust deficit’, ‘militancy’, ‘sponsored terrorism’ when they talk about Pakistan. There seems a deliberate attempt to avoid the phenomenon related to progress, prosperity and civilized society when it comes to talk of Pakistan. Their arguments lack any references pointing to the economic, civic or political progress achieved by Pakistan since its independence. According to SM Krishna, the trust deficit found between the two countries is due to the irresponsible attitude of Pakistan. He asserts that Pakistan should stand by its commitment not to allow its soil used for the activities of terrorism against India. The similar discourse is repeated by Narendra Modi in his speech when he says, “Pakistan must also take its responsibility seriously to create an appropriate environment.” Another Ex-Indian Prime Minister: Manmohan Singh also dismisses the possibility of normalizing relationship with Pakistan “unless the Government of Pakistan fulfills in letter and spirit, its commitment.” Sushma Swaraj also blames Pakistan for the poor relations between the two countries. She calls Pakistan “an expert in trying to mask malevolence with verbal duplicity.” These politicians apart from their political differences talk of India as an emerging power and responsible country of the world but beset by a hypocrite neighbor.

Narendra Modi intends to have dialogue with Pakistan but he says that it should be without the shadow of terrorism. He again associates terrorism with Pakistan like the other politicians mentioned in this study. Pakistan is consistently accused of funding, supporting and training the terror organizations and outfits. In the speeches there is another common pattern, there is a demand from Pakistan to act against these terror organizations in letter and spirit and provide the proof of these actions. Such demands from Pakistan on international forums seem a deliberate ploy by the Indian statesmen to keep a constant pressure on Pakistan. In the analysed

speeches there has been a consistent questioning on Pakistan's role in promoting terrorism but there is avoidance from the Indian speakers of searching the instability due to any internal reasons.

The discussion in the preceding paragraph shows a concerted effort by the selected Indian politicians from different political parties. But they all unanimously agree to bash, criticize and accuse Pakistan on national and international forums. A discourse emerges from their speeches that Pakistan is an irresponsible country that constantly interferes in the India and for supporting militant organizations. In modern times, Pakistan is presented in the light of militancy, poverty disorganized state. Indian politicians start discussion on terrorism, its threat to the world and then connect this threat of terror with Pakistan as a centre of such undesirable activities. Moreover, in all these speeches there is a hint on the weak control of government on Pakistani institutions and various organizations. The speakers mention the announcements of confidence building measures by Pakistani government followed by brutal acts of terrorism on the Indian soil from Pakistan. Perhaps this refers to those elements within Pakistan who are so string that they sabotage their government's efforts to find peace with India.

Apart from accusations against Pakistan by these politicians there are a few other common patterns emerging from the analysis of linguistic data of their speeches. This Pakistan bashing is contrasted with an exact opposite view of India as a responsible and fast developing country.

It is a country of rich traditions and a new emerging power on the horizon of the world. The themes of 'New India' and an emerging global leader emerge if one decodes the linguistic categories present in the speeches of these Indian leaders. The current Prime Minister Narendra Modi introduces the might of Indian size by telling that it is the one-sixth of the world population. He expresses the scale of Indian progress in social transformation and economy as hardly seen in history. He pledges to use the Indian resources for the countries that need the help from other countries. The Indian Prime Minister talks of seas, space and cyber space giving an image of India that is ready to take up the challenges of the changing technological world of the 21st century. He calls the nations of the world to tune up themselves for the present times of advancements and progress. Mr. Manmohan Singh talks of the modernizing and sophistication of the defense mechanism of India. His talk of the acquisition of heavy weapons point towards enhancing the Indian military might. In SM Krishna's speech to the UN glorifies Indian role in the matters various welfare tasks and issues of significance to the world.

Krishna mentions the contribution of over 100,000 peace keepers for the UN peace keeping missions. He also talks of Indian participation in the developmental and humanitarian activities through NEPAD and UNDP. He declares poverty as an enemy hampering the way of prosperity. In his speech, he mentions Indian trust for G-20 the top world forum for the established and emerging economies of the world. He also expresses his country's resolve to work for the climate of the earth. This builds further a discourse that India is a responsible country, a country that understands the key challenges faced by the world in the 21st century. He mentions Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan for the nuclear disarmament in 2006. It creates an image of India as a responsible nuclear power in the world. The image of a tolerant country is

built when SM Shankar tells of the 25 million US dollars aid pledged through UN to help Pakistani people suffering from the havocs of flood. Like a big power of the region, he also talks of the reconstruction and elections in Afghanistan. He assures the UN General Assembly of the firm Indian resolve to stand by the principles of the United Nations. All these arguments build a case for India as a mature, responsible, tolerant power and an emerging global socio-political power. There are relatively similar kinds of effort to build almost the same discourse in Sushma Swaraj's address to the UN General Assembly. She talks of certain set objectives of her government, the achievement of SDG goals and a major exercise to eliminate poverty and bring social transformation having no parallel before. She talks of millions of new bank accounts, health insurance program, big housing schemes, woman development and certain other civic projects. These projects aim to build a "New India". In her speech to there is the mention of climate change and the threat to the global environment. Like a mature and advanced country, she talks of the efforts by India to meet the challenges of climate change. She warns the UN of having to face the same fate as that of League of Nations if it does not value its institutions. According to her the UN is in a dire need of reforms to save its reputation and image. In the concluding part of her speech she refers to Mahatma Gandhi's famous hymn which lays a stress on the feeling the pains of others. This to her is the Indian outlook towards the world. She concludes her speech by pledging wellbeing, peace, prosperity and serenity for all human beings. Hence, she too builds an image of India that is quite contrary to the image of Pakistan built in her as well as in the speeches of other three Indian politicians and government representatives.

Conclusion

The present research has presented how the Indian politicians over the years from different political parties and eras build their national agenda. As far as Pakistan-India relationships are concerned, there emerges a definite planned policy on the part of Indian politicians. The analysis of the vocabulary items used by these politicians demonstrate a specific pattern where positive self is projected through the use of words that help in forming such image. On the other hand, the linguistic analysis of the vocabulary items used for Pakistan contains negative words that help to form a negative image of Pakistan. All the speakers who have been analysed used words that indicate a trust deficit when it comes to relationship with Pakistan. Most of the times, when there is mentioning of Indo-Pak relationship, we find aggressive unpleasant words used for Pakistan, some of these words are: 'terror', 'terrorism', 'duplicity', 'malevolence', 'threat', 'deceit', 'deception', 'violations', 'terror funding', 'killing', 'transgressor'. All these words have negative connotations and present Pakistan in a negative light. There is unanimity among the discussed politicians about the image of India. However, the rhetoric built for India includes words as: 'economic transformation', 'poverty elimination', 'educated India', 'energized India', 'developed India', and the 'new India'. They project India as a principled, responsible country, passing through the stages of progress and rise at a fair pace. There emerges a discourse that India is a positive participant in the national

and international activities. There have been many constructive measures for the social welfare being of the poor Indian people. India utilizes its resources for projects enhancing science and technology. This way India is emerging a power in the world to reckon with. Especially, India is at the forefront for facing the new challenges of the 21st century like the climate change and the eradication of poverty. It stands through its commitment to follow the guiding principles of its nation and an active member of the world community. India wants to see the UN as a more fruitful organization through reformation, demanding more roles for a country like India. However, there is a constant theme in the speeches of the four national leaders from India; there is a definite pattern that points towards the irresponsible behavior of its Western neighbor: Pakistan. If on one hand, India uses its resources for the betterment and facilities of masses, Pakistan lags behind by wasting its resources on funding of terror and terror outfits. The Pakistan image is created of a country that sponsors terrorism as an official policy in the other countries especially India. There seems a secret understanding between the terror organizations and the state of Pakistan. It suffers from duplicity and hypocrisy. It demands good relations with India but at the same time, there are forces in Pakistan that sabotage the peace process whenever there is a sincere effort of talks on the part of India.

The present study accepts that there have been some limitations as well. Some may say that these selected speeches by the politicians are a small scale for generalization of a pertinent discourse. But this end term paper is limited by the time frame and the word limit. However, greater amount of time and more relaxation in limits of the text, there is a scope of carrying out this research on more speeches and including more politicians in the study. The results drawn in the present study depend on a small scale of discourse analysis done on the selected speeches. The study establishes from the choice of words and expressions by the Indian politicians that they present a brighter, promising and prosperous picture of India while Pakistan is presented with such terms and expressions that give it a negative, unprogressive, interfering and unattractive image.

References

- Bhatia, A. 2006. Political discourse analysis of political press conferences. *Discourse and Society* 17(2): 68-80.
- Burki, S. J. 1991. *Pakistan the continuing search for nationhood*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Fairclough, N. 2000. *New labour, new language*. London: Routledge.
- <https://youtu.be/8tWrXLMjDzk>
- Jalilifar, A. R., and Alavi, M. 2011. Power and politics of language use: A survey of hedging devices in political interviews. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 44(1): 43-66.
- Mahmood, S. 2002. *Pakistan political roots & developments 1947-1999*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. 2014. *Politics and rhetoric: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Rashidi, N., and Souzandehfar, M. 2010. A critical discourse analysis of the debates

- between republicans and democrats over the continuation of war in Iraq. *Journal of Linguistics and Intercultural Education* 3(13): 55-82.
- Singh, I., and Peccei, J. S. 2004. *Language and politics* In *Language, society and power*, eds. Thomas, L. et al. New York: Routledge.
- Synnott, H. 2009. *Transforming Pakistan*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (Ed.). 1989. *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.